

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/509,201	06/30/2005	Seung-Hwan Moon	ABS-1610 US	7410	
32605 7590 03/04/2009 Haynes and Boone, LLP			EXAMINER		
IP Section			MANDEVILLE, JASON M		
2323 Victory . SUITE 700	Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Dallas, TX 75	219		2629		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/04/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/509,201	MOON, SEUNG-HWAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JASON M. MANDEVILLE	2629	

	JASON M. MANDEVILLE	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar i, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
periods:    The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing   The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A   The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A   The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A   The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A   The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A   The period for reply expires	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belot (c) ∑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal, and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); tter form for appeal by materially red	E below); lucing or simplifying t	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13</li> </ol>	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>	:		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		,	•
7. \( \bigcirc \text{propurposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)} how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3.5-7 and 10-15 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	theface and the date of Class - No.		the entrand
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See note above.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
Jason Mandeville	/Regina Liang/		
Examiner	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2629	
Art Unit: 2629	,		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The applicant has amended several of the claims to recite an "nth horizontal pixel line." This amendment has been made as an attempt to overcome the 55 USC 112 rejections made by the examiner in the prior office action. By making this amendment, the applicant has narrowed the scope of the pending claims. Thus, the amendments raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the examiner. However, the examiner maintains that the amendments made to the claims are not sufficient to overcome the previous 35 USC 112 rejections. The examiner stated in the Final Office Action dated 12 December 2008 that a clear and unambiguous determination of the "nth line" is essential to define the structure and/or method of the claims divention. By amending to recite the "nth horizontal pixel line," the applicant has only resolved part of the ambiguity surrounding the claims. While the amended claims make it clear that nth data from a horizontal line is being compared to (n-1)th data from a horizontal line, it is still unclear what is meant by the terms "nth" and "(n-1)th". That is, it is unclear whether "n" relates to time or to position (a, data is compared between frames for the same line, or data is compared between adjacent lines in the same frame). Therefore, the 35 USC 112 rejection is maintained, as is the rejection based on the cited orior art.